

REMARKS

This responds to the Final office action of 6 June 2007 which rejected all pending claims 1-18.

All rejections are traversed.

The 35 USC 101 objection of claim 6 has been fixed.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11- 14 are amended.

Claims 3, 8-10 and 15-18 are previously presented.

Claims 1-18 are resubmitted.

35 USC 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1, 8, 11, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Carlson et al. 6,842,898. These rejections are traversed.

The disclosed invention comprises a generic and reusable thread monitor. The thread monitor has no knowledge of the owner process or other thread functionalities. The invention provides a loose coupling between a monitored thread and the thread monitor because the services provided by the threaded monitor are optional for a given thread. A designer can decide which individual threads should take advantage of the thread monitor and which should not. The thread monitor will not monitor all threads by default,

Independent claim 1 recites, in essence, an optional self registration method that allows thread to self register itself for monitoring by the class. This differs from Carlson, which does not provide optional thread monitoring on an optional basis by a thread that is monitored. Carlson also does not provide self registration of a thread to be monitored. Our invention is generic. The user decides whether or not to use the self registration/thread monitoring for a given thread.

Dependent claim 8 should be allowable in view of its dependence on claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable.

Independent claim 11 is similar to claim 1. Claim 11 is directed to an (optional) self registration of the threads and the instantiating of the monitor in one thread of the same process. This is not disclosed by Carlson. Carlson also does not teach the applicants' claimed self registration of a thread.

Dependent claim 13 should be allowable in view of its dependency on independent claim 11 which is asserted herein to be allowable. Also, dependent claim 13 teaches self registration which further distinguishes it from Carlson.

Dependent claim 15 is similar to claim 8, and is not taught by Carlson for the reasons set forth with respect to the prior discussion of dependent claim 8. Dependent claim 15 should also be allowable in view of its dependency on independent claim 11 which is asserted herein to be allowable.

35 USC 103(a) Rejections

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 9, 10, and 16-18, were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Carlson. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Dependent claim 2 should be allowable in view of its dependency on independent claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable. The Examiner stated that claim 2 would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a thread un-registration method since it is well known in the art that threads can complete their execution once the task is complete. The applicants assert that the modification of Carlson proposed by the Examiner is not obvious and respectfully request the Examiner to support his assertion of obviousness with supporting evidence. This can be done with an affidavit per the MPEP. The Examiner's unsupported assertion does not support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Dependent claim the 3 should be allowable in view of its dependency on independent claim 1 which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, the merits of the rejection are moot and need not be further discussed.

Dependent claim 5 should be allowable in view of its dependency on independent claim 1 which is believed to be allowable. Carlson also does not disclose optional thread self registration for a thread alive check.

Dependent claims 9 and 10 are believed to be allowable in view of their dependency on independent claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable. The Examiner comments regarding obviousness are moot and need not be further discussed. If the Examiner wishes to pursue this obviousness issue, he is requested to provide an affidavit supporting his assertions.

Dependent claims 16 through 18 are dependent upon allowable independent claim 11 and therefore should be similarly allowable.

35 USC 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6, 7, 12, and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Carlson taken with Bower 7,051,331. These rejections are traversed.

Dependent claim 4 should be allowable in view of its dependence on independent claim 1 which is asserted to be allowable. Claim 4 should also be allowable in view of its recitation of self registration by a thread which is asserted is not taught by the cited art. The Examiners unsupported assertions regarding obviousness are therefore moot.

Dependent claims 6 and 7 should be allowable in view of their dependence on independent claim 1 which asserted to be allowable. The Examiner asserts that the Bower Heart Beat method covers applicants' thread poll registration. Applicants

disagree. The thread poll capability executes some functionality of the given thread, which is more than just heart beat. The claimed invention provides complete freedom in a generic way for the thread designer to implement its "poll" method. It is up to the thread designer to figure out what needs to be checked to determine if the thread is functioning normally and respond to the thread monitor when the poll method is called. These claims also recite self registration by a thread which is not taught by the cited art.

Dependent claim 12 which is similar to dependent claim should be allowable in view of its dependence on claim independent claim 11 which asserted to be allowable. This dependent claim is directed to self registering the Heart Beat thread. It therefore need not be further discussed and is therefore distinguishable from the prior art for the same reasons discussed with respect to dependent claim 4.

Dependent claim 14 is directed to self registration by a thread which is not taught by the cited art. Dependent claim 14 is allowable as being dependent upon independent claim 11 which is believed to be allowable. The Examiner's comments are therefore moot.

Examiner's comments in paragraphs 30-36 have been considered. Comments 30-33 are moot in view of the claiming of self registration. Comments 34-36 are moot since all dependent claims are allowable in view or their dependency on an independent claim as priority discussed.

Regarding the Examiner's comment in paragraph 31 re claim 1, amended claim 1 is distinguishable for the reasons priority discussed. Regarding the Examiner's comments in paragraphs 32-36, the referenced dependent claims are patentable as being dependent on an independent claim asserted to be allowable. Further, regarding the Examiner's comment in paragraph 34, the Examiner is reminded that dependent claims 2, 9, and 10 are dependent; they do not stand alone; and each must be evaluated on the basis of what the dependent claim together with what its parent claim recites.

The applicants wish to point out that in the present invention; there is a loose coupling between a thread that may be monitored and the thread monitor. In view of this, the service of the thread monitor is optional for a given thread. A designer can decide which individual threads should take advantage of the thread monitor and which should not. The thread monitor does not monitor all threads by default, or become an overhead for threads that do not need to use the thread monitor. This capability is not disclosed by any of the cited art.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned if the prosecution of the application can be expedited by so doing.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 19 August 2008

/Donald M. Duft/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Donald. M. Duft, Reg. No. 17,484

Duft Borsen & Fishman LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691